DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 778 CE 054 525

AUTHOR Constantinides, Xenophon; And Others
TITLE The Training/Development of In-Company Trainers/Supervisors of Young People--The Case of Greece.
INSTITUTION European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, Berlin (West Germany).
REPORT NO ISBN-92-826-0647-3
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 77p.; For related documents, see CE 054 520-521 and CE 054 526.
AVAILABLE FROM UNIPUB, 4661-F Assembly Drive, Lanham, MD 20706-4391 (Catalogue No. HX-56-89-328-EN-C).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Adult Education; *Adult Educators; Corporate Education; Education Work Relationship; Foreign Countries; Industrial Training; Job Analysis; Job Skills; Teacher Background; *Teacher Education; Teacher Role; *Trainers; Unions; Vocational Education; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Greece; *Train the Trainer

ABSTRACT

This document describes the training of the in-company trainer of young people in Greece. Chapter 1 describes the context of training. Chapter 2 describes the methodology used in the study including questionnaires, interviews, and a forum. Chapter 3 reports the results of the study in the following categories: training manager, in-company trainer, in-company trainee, and training of trainers. Chapter 4 provides the views of institutional and organizational representatives, training managers, trainers, trainees, and trade union representatives and includes the forum proceedings. Conclusions and a summary are provided in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 provides recommendations through the definition of the problem and guidelines for solutions. A six-item bibliography is included. Appendices include listings of enterprises and organizations and their representatives; forum participants; questionnaire and interview schedules for training managers, educational and training organizations, trade union representatives, trainees, and trainers. (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED312278

CEDEFOP Document

The training/development of in-company trainers/ supervisors of young people — The case of Greece

European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 054 525

CEDEFOP Document

The training/development of in-company trainers/supervisors of young people — The case of Greece

IVEPE
Xenophon Constantinides, John Markopoulos,
Stamatis Paleocrassas, George Protopapas,
Kathrin Economou, Maria Psilopoulou

June 1988
First edition, Berlin 1989

Published by:

CEDEFOP — European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training,
Jean Monnet House,
Bundesallee 22, **D-1000 Berlin 15**
Tel. (0 30) 88 41 20; Telex 184 163 eucen d;
Telefax (0 30) 88 41 22 22

The Centre was established by Regulation (EEC) No 337/75 of the Council of the European Communities

This publication is also available in the following language:

FR ISBN 92-826-0648-1

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1989

ISBN 92-826-0647-3

Catalogue number: HX-56-89-328-EN-C

Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Belgium

C E D E F O P I N T R O D U C T I O N

This report on the training of the in-company trainer of young people is one of a series of national reports on this subject, commissioned by CEDEFOP and financed jointly by CEDEFOP and a national authority. Reports were completed during 1988 on the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, France, Ireland, Italy and the United Kingdom. They are now being published in the original language and English and French. Further studies have been launched in relation to Luxembourg and the Netherlands, while a synthesis report is also being prepared.

CEDEFOP's work on the training of trainers before these series of studies were launched was of a fairly general nature. A series of national reports on the professional situation and training of trainers in the Member States Communities was published in 1983 and 1984. We have also prepared a paper on the subject at the invitation of the Commission for the Advisory Committee on Vocational Training. In December 1987 a seminar was held to see how national public training authorities organised the training and updating of trainers whom they themselves employed in their own training centres.

The generally accepted view that alternance systems of education and training, such as apprenticeship, the German dual system, contrats formation-emploi etc., should and can play a major role in the improvement of training provision in the future, has often failed to take account of the key questions of whether there are enough trainers with appropriate training and experience within companies to ensure the quality of company-based training in such systems. Hence when a proposal for a study on this subject was made by the (then) Manpower Services Commission in the United Kingdom, CEDEFOP responded positively. CEDEFOP was particularly interested because the original proposal emphasised the value of ensuring a strong Community dimension, with the possibility of cooperation between the research teams involved. As can be seen from the report, each of the national research teams was able to visit two other countries and follow a programme there organised by the research team in that country. There were also three meetings at Community level, the last of which discussed the draft reports. The final reports were prepared on the basis of comments made by colleagues at this meeting. It will nevertheless be noted that the reports are essentially national reports, i.e. written by a research team on or about the systems and problems of their country. The Community dimension although acknowledged by all those concerned to have been of value, does not come through in the reports as clearly as had initially been hoped. To some extent this is not surprising, the arrangements for training of trainers reflect not only the general approach to education and training in the country concerned, but also its economic structure and state of development.

It will be seen that in effect, of the six countries concerned in the initial study only in the Federal Republic of Germany is there any legislative provision which regulates the situation. In Germany one can only be a trainer within the dual system, even on a part time basis, if one has fulfilled certain conditions. In other Member States, there is no legislative conditions, although in the United Kingdom, for example, there is a provision for controlling the quality of training provided, including the quality of the trainers, before organisations receive approved training status in the Youth Training Scheme.

The reports also show the great difficulty in arriving at satisfactory and comprehensible definitions. Even within the defined area of study, it was found that there are very many different groups of trainers, depending upon issues such as the size of the companies concerned, the organisation of the companies' training arrangements etc.

The difficulties encountered underline the obstacles to any overall Community action in this field. However all the participants in the exercise were as convinced at the end as at the beginning, of the need for much greater attention to be paid by companies and public authorities to improving the quality of the trainers of young people, and CEDEFOP will continue its work in this field.

Enrique Retuerto de la Torre
Deputy Director

Berlin, March 1989

COMPANIES ASSOCIATION FOR THE INDUSTRIAL AND PROFESSIONAL
TRAINING OF THEIR STAFF (IVEPE)

THE TRAINING/DEVELOPMENT OF IN-COMPANY TRAINERS/ SUPERVISORS OF YOUNG PEOPLE

RESEARCH REPORT PRODUCED FOR CEDEFOP

THE CASE OF GREECE

ATHENS

June 1988

RESEARCH TEAM

CONSTANTINIDES, Xenophon

(MARKOPOULOS*, John)

PALEOCRASSAS, Stamatis

PROTOPAPAS, George

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

ECONOMOU, Kathrin

PSILOPOULOU, Maria

---

* Participated in the preliminary phase of the project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	CONTEXT	Pages
1.0	The context of Training	4
II.	METHOD	
2.0	The context of Methodology	6
III.	RESULTS	
3.0	Results of the study	9
3.1	The Training Manager	9
3.2	The in-Company Trainer	11
3.3	The in-Company Trainee	13
3.4	The Training of Trainers	14
IV.	ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	
4.1	Views of the VIPs	18
4.2	Views of the Training Managers	20
4.3	Views of the Trainers	22
4.4	Views of the Trainees	24
4.5	Views of the Trade Union Representatives	26
4.6	Forum Proceedings	28
V.	CONCLUSIONS	
5.0	Summary	31
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.1	The Definition of the Problem	33
6.2	Guidelines for Solutions	35
VII.	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
VIII.	APPENDICES	39

I. CONTEXT

1.0 The context of Training

1.1. It is imperative to clarify the context for the Greek case of the project for two reasons. First, because Greece did not participate in the preceding broader CEDEFOP project concerning the training of trainers. This implies that there has been no definition for the broader context. Second, because there os no parity between the level of development of the in-company training of young people in Greece and the corresponding levels in the other five countries taking part in the project.

1.2. In-company training of young people in the form of alternance or apprenticeship has been a relatively new concept, if one views it objectively using strict criteria. Until very recently the young apprentices were required to finish each day a regular work load at the company and afterwards attend the vocational school, thereby having an unreasonable and cruel daily work load, unfit even for adults. During the last three years these conditions seem to have improved with the introduction of an alternance concept requiring the trainees to attend school on a full-time basis for the first year of their training; for the next two years, they are expected to be with the company for four days per week and at school for the remaining one day. This type of training is offered by OAED * apprenticeship schools and was legitimized by the Law 1655/85 of the Ministry of Education. Before 1985, these schools were operating outside the mal education system.

* Manpower / Employment Organization supervised by the Ministry of Employment.

1.3. Law 1655/85 introduced another concept of in-company training, for students attending vocational schools of the Ministry of Education. However this training scheme, which is not alternance or apprenticeship, is complementary to the training offered at the school and is of limited duration (about 3 months). The Law refers to it as supplementary practical training in the work place, and at this stage, it is not compulsory for obvious reasons. It would be impossible to secure such a large number of work places in industry and in enterprises. Consequently, at present, a very small number of students who graduate from vocational schools of the Ministry of Education go through such a scheme of practical training.

1.4. A similar requirement for practical training for a period of 6 months has been introduced in the corresponding Law for technological education. These institutes function within the context of tertiary education and train "technologists", which is a professional level equivalent to that of higher technician. Again a very small number of students fulfill this requirement for practical training in a manner that could be identified as in-company training. In-company placement is problematic because company offers are rather limited.

1.5. Finally, in-company training applies as well for a limited number of university students who choose to apply their "Diploma thesis" on an in-company problem. In this case practical training is not required but rather a thesis, which may not apply to a real problem relating to production or management, e.t.c....

1.6. In-company training of young people outside the alternance or the supplementary practical training scheme is practically non-existent in Greece. One could refer to situations where

young people (16-25 years old) are hired by companies and are offered induction training schemes of short duration. However, these cases are very limited in numbers, for many reasons. First, it is evident that a very small number of young people in this age group are hired. This is clearly substanciated by the high youth unemployment which prevails. Secondly, because of the compulsory draft system very few young men are employable before the age of 25 (the military service lasts about 2 years). Of course this applies only to men. On the other hand the situation is not any better for women who are not generally hired in production (with the exception of routine assembly line jobs, especially in the textile industry and handicraft, which do not require systematic training), or for office work in large numbers. Thirdly, the vocational aspirations of young people are not compatible with the demand of the labour market. As a result a very large number of young people who have pursued general education studies followed by a university education reach the age of 25 without having acquired any employable skills.

1.7. It is rather evident, therefore, that the training context for Greece is significantly different from that of the other five countries which take part in this project. When it comes to in-company training, it must be understood at the outset that, for the case of Greece, we are refering partly to the alternance and apprenticeship training of young people in the formal school system, and mainly to the induction training and further training of adults (older than 25 years old) who are already employed by the company.

II. METHOD

2.0 The context of Methodology

2.1. After having clarified the context of training in Greece, as related to the scope of this project,

the task of clarifying the methodology context is much easier. This is so because we will be able to present in turn our choices with regard to the methodology used, without having to go into detailed rationales. Nevertheless, the deviations from the methodology laid out by CEDEFOP are not significant.

2.2. The method used the following research tools : questionnaires, interviews and a forum. Questionnaires were given to a number of training managers, trainers, trainees, trade union representatives and training organizations. Samples of these questionnaires are presented in the APPENDICES (VIII). Interviews were taken from a selected number of people belonging to all previously stated categories. The main selection criterion, which was applied at the descretion of the interviewer once he/she was at the plant site, was to identify someone experienced who seemed to have something interesting and important to say, within the context of the project. The forum took place in Athens (15 June 1988) and was attended by approximatively 20 people who were selected by the research team because of their long experience as practitioners, supervisors and managers of in-company training. Finally, the team decided to interview a selected number of VIPs who in some manner represented the "social partners" and other leading social groups.

2.3. The subjects used for interviewing and for the completion of the questionnaires were drawn from a "sample" of companies. It must be said at the outset that this was not a scientifically derived statistical sample. The team feels that, given the general context of in-company training in Greece, it would be rather impossible to synthesize such a sample for this project. Consequently, the

"sample" of companies was drawn from a list of the 200 largest companies*, as provided by ICAP, using the following criteria : it should include companies which, according to data provided by OAED, offer alternance or apprenticeship positions for students attending the formal school system; it should include companies which are classified by the Σ.Σ.Δ.Π. (Greek Personnel Management Association) as companies having a systematic training function; and, it should include companies whose serious training policy is substantiated by the existence of a Training Manager in their administrative structure. A list with the organizations usd for the study is presented in the APPENDICES (VIII).

2.4 The VIPs were selected using less objective criteria. It was simply up to the research team to decide which important persons should be interviewed in order that their views could help the authors assess possible future prospects regarding the concept of in-company training. As a result, a number of persons were selected for this purpose who were known to have expressed their views on training in publications or orally during well publicized meetings on this subject. This included directors of training organizations (OAED, SELETE), well known employer representatives (including the Employers' representative on CEDEFOP's board) and trade union representatives who have on various occasions manifested interesting attitudes on in-company training.

*This differentiates the Greek project from the other projects which, according to the general directive, are to leave out of the research large companies with systematic training departments.

III. RESULTS

3.0 The processing of the questionnaires, of the notes taken during interviews and other qualitative data collected during our communication with VIPs, Training Managers, Trainers, Trainees and Trade Union Representatives, synthesizes an overall picture for the Greek case of incompany training which is characterized by underdevelopment and widespread variation. One can find companies (mainly large public organizations) with a highly sophisticated incompany training system and also companies (they constitute the majority) which leave training to chance.
In all situations we investigated, it seems that in-company training is set-up primarily for the further training of the employees and not for the young people in alternance or apprenticeship programs. Within this general and overall context of the situation we can proceed to analyze each of the components and dimensions of training as they were assessed within the framework of this study.

3.1 The Training Manager

3.1.1 The Training Manager, in the majority of the companies which were examined, did not exist, inspite of the extra effort made by the team to include in the research "sample" companies which according to the Σ.Σ.Δ.Π. (Greek Personnel Management Association) had advanced training systems. Instead, if the company was offering systematic training to their employees,the Personnel Manager was also managing the training activities. Only one in six companies out of the total number which were examined had under their employment someone who by educational background, experience and special training functioned as Training Manager. Again large public organizations seemed to be leading the way among companies with appointed Training Managers. Smaller companies which had undertaken in-company training of young people in the form of alternance or apprenticeship had not in every case appointed a training manager.

3.1.2 The majority of those in charge of training in the companies which were studied, have had training as a preparation for managing training. They were either managers with no technical educational background or engineers who had come into training, and had developed an interest in training, while they were supervising training activities in their company. Some of them, a significant number, after their involvement with training, have participated in special seminars on training, offered by private organizations, which had been recently set up in Greece, specializing on the concept of Training of Trainers. Others have gone abroad (primarily to other European countries) on educational trips or on exchange visits, with intent to acquire knowledge and skills on the management of training.

3.1.3 The recruitment of Training Managers was not investigated thoroughly in this study. Nevertheless, it was possible to put the question to a selected number of high level managers, regarding the criteria they would use in hiring a Training Manager, if there were such an opening in the company and that function had not been assigned to the personnel manager. Their answer gave emphasis to personal characteristics such as a generally accepted personality, being personable and having good communication skills; and the most important, to have significant experience in both, succesful management and development-implementation of in-company training programs for adults.

3.1.4 The companies which have chosen to assign the management of their activities to a special training manager (who in some cases has a councelling role or is under the supervision of the personnel manager), have succeeded in creating a systematic training program for their employees. This, in turn has enhanced the sophistication of their training policy regarding the in-company training of young people who are not employed by the company. Furthermore, their personnel recruitment and development schemes have improved and, more importantly, this development has had a positive effect on labour relations.

3.2 The In-company Trainer

3.2.1 There seems to be a large variation in the characteristics and function of in-company trainers. Again, where there is a specific training policy with systematic planning and supervision, the trainer has a high job satisfaction (he has had a say for getting involved in training) and he can even see training as a professional career. He usually has a high educational background and, beside his function as a trainer, he also is supervising some production section or some technical department. On the other hand, when a training policy is absent (in most cases involving in-company training of young people), the trainer is selected primarily because he is experienced in the subject matter which he is expected to transmit to the young people, and most often he has had no say in the selection. His job satisfaction is not high and he is worried that this additional function will impede, rather than enhance, his promotion in the company.

3.2.2 There is no variation with regard to the qualifications of the in-company trainer. It seems that he is selected using two criteria, which are common to all companies, regardless whether they have a training policy or not : his knowledge on the subject and his practical experience. It seems that it is not possible to use objectively such additional criteria as paedagogic ability and knowledge, and social skills. Furthermore, it is difficult to acquire such skills afterwards because there is lack of opportunities for special training programs which would lead to such qualifications.

3.2.3 There was general agreement among fifty three trainers interviewed so far that there is great need for better preparatory and continuing training for the trainers. Only twelve of them had undergone some further training program which was specially developed to meet their needs as trainers. The resources available for the training of trainers were rather limited. The most

common solution, applied to large companies with ties outside of Greece, was to send trainers to educational trips abroad for special training programs set up in large foreign companies with sophisticated training systems. Another solution was to hire one of the private organizations which operate in Greece and specialize in the accelerated training of in-company trainers. Another potential resource for the training of incompany trainers is SELETE (Institute for Training Vocational Education Teachers). This institution has the necessary facilities and human resources to help the companies, by setting up special accelerated programs. Strangely, there has not been any interest expressed on the part of the companies for this solution. The President of this institution told us that he was disappointed from the results of a survey which he conducted in order to identify quantitatively and qualitatively the needs of industry for the training of their trainers.

3.2.4 Finally, it seems that the in-company trainer does not function as a professional trainer. This explains the fact that in a country where all workers, in all aspects of employment, are organized professionally and in unions, the in-company trainer is not, and strangely, he does not seem anxious to belong to a professional group of trainers. Instead, he sees himself as a professional in the field for which he received his basic training and who extends his function to cover some training needs. He is aware of the absence of any form of professional organization for those who are involved partly or on full-time basis with training, yet he doesn't appear anxious to do something in that direction, perhaps because he generally does not consider himself as a trainer. This is substanciated by the fact that almost all of the trainers who where interviewed felt that they should be receiving <u>additional</u> compensation for their training function.

3.3 The In-company Trainee

3.3.1 Statistically, the in-company trainee who is being offered systematic training is an employee of the company which provides the training in the age group 31-40 years old, and someone who needs further training. Induction training is offered rarely and only in situations of mass hirings for large plant expansions. Of course, in-company trainees are also young people who attend apprenticeship programs. Only, they are a lot fewer in numbers, when compared to the employees who are undergoing training. OAED places approximatively 8.000 apprentices in companies each year. However, the majority of them are placed in small companies or workshops where training is not systematic and in many cases not even supervised.

3.3.2 The OAED apprentices generally follow a training scheme which is not carefully planned nor systematic. Many times the subject of training is not relevant to the theoretical training which they receive at school. It seems that it is very difficult to match in-company apprenticeship positions with the interests of young people studying at OAED schools. The end result is for young people to accept any in-company positions because they are scarce, even though they provide them with the wrong type of training. Their trainers in the majority are experienced workers with no special training to function as trainers of young people.

3.3.3 According to Law 1404/1983 which concerns the function and administration of the Technological Educational Institutes (TEI), one of the requirements for graduation is the completion of 6 months practical training in a real work environment. Consequently, one finds students from the TEIs in many companies working on a thesis or accumulating some experience which relates to their field of study. The majority of these students are placed in large public organizations, companies or even in ministries.

During the last two years a significant effort has been initiated with the support of the Union of Greek Industries (ΣΕΒ) to place TEI students for their practical training in private industries. The first year of this project approx. 1,000 students were placed. This number increased to 4,000 during the second year. No further increase of latter number is expected, thow.

3.3.4 Finally, one also finds university students working on a part time basis inside companies. However, these young people cannot be classified as in-company trainees. They are there working on some company problem which is related to their diploma thesis. This thesis is required for graduation. However, it is up to each student and his major professor to decide as to whether the subject of the thesis will be such that it will require in-company investigation or practical training. The number of university students who are placed for this purpose in private companies is relatively small. On the other hand the numbers are significant in public organizations, public companies and in ministries.

3.4 The Training of Trainers

3.4.1 Within the general context of in-company training already described, and given its low level of development, one can identify four concepts of training the in-company trainers, wherever and whenever it is provided. These concepts, which may have been used separately or in various combinations, are the following : training at the Paedagogical School of SELETE; accelerated training through a two-week seminar offered by OAED; training offered by private, personnel development companies; and training offered abroad.

3.4.2 The training of trainers offered by the Paedagogical School of SELETE is the most systematic one and is designed primarily for vocational school teachers. It has a duration which is either 6 months or one year. The shorter program is offered to university graduates and the longer to all non-university graduates. Both programs concentrate on the poaedagogical dimension of training and imclude courses on Psychology of Learning, General and Special Paedagogics, Vocational and Career Guidance, Development and Use of Audio-visual Media, Curriculum design and Teaching Elementary Technology. It can be easily concluded that these programs are not attractive to private companies because of their long duration. Very few companies can afford to release an employee for such a long time to attend such programs. Nevertheless, there were a number of trainers, employed mainly by Public Organizations or Companies, who attended this program which, incidently, provides the only official certificate for such training. There was an unsucessful attempt by the Administration of SELETE to overcome the problem of the long duration when this problem was pointed out by company representatives during a two-day symposium on the Training of Trainers which took place in Athens on November 1985. Unsuccessful because when they surveyed the companies to identify their specific training of trainers needs, in order to design an accelerated program, they found a very limited interest on the part of the companies.

3.4.3 The training of trainers program offered by OAED on the other hand has an overwhelming demand. A demand which is becoming more and more difficult to satisfy on the part of OAED, even though the program lasts for only two weeks and when compared in content to that offered by SELETE it can be assessed as marginal. For the last year there were over 500 applications fron in-company trainers for participation in the program. Of course this demand can be justified by the fact that attendance to this program is <u>compulsory</u> in order for an

in-company program to qualify for partial funding by the Social Fund and OAED (30% by the EECs Social Fund and 37% by OAED). Nevertheless, this program, which in essense is a long seminar, could not be considered adequate as a training of trainers program*.

3.4.4 The training of trainers program which is offered by several private and semi-public personnel development organizations is usually tailor-made, to fit each company's special needs. Nevertheless, most of these organizations offer in addition several standard packages which include training activities such as media development and use, training paedagogics, training program design, etc. Others have designed several basic modules which are synthesized accordingly to fit the needs of the individual company. A common characteristic of these programs is that they are all accelerated and perhaps it is due to this characteristic that they are definately more attractive to companies. Attendance in most of these programs are certified with an unofficial title. For the record, the companies which offer such services and came to our attention are : ELKEPA, EEDE, CENECO and INTERMEDIA.

* During the writing of the final version of this report it was anounced by OAED that this program is being terminated.

3.4.5 Finally, the training of trainers abroad has many modes which are not expected to be characteristic only of the Greek situation. Multi-national companies which operate branches in Greece (GOODYEAR, MOTOR OIL, etc) choose to send their Greek trainers for training to their European or overseas headquarters. This, however, is not an exclusive solution because it has the prerequisite that the trainers speak a foreign language. An alternative solution being used is bringing to Greece a team of trainers who conduct an accelerated program using instantaneous translation. Greek companies, especially those which have established foreign ties through their export activities, use foreign resources for the training of their trainers on two occasions. First, within the framework of purchasing some new equipment (the training of trainers is often included in the pruchasing contract) and second, as an independent activity proposed and designed by the training manager in cooperation with a foreigh training centre or a training department of a foreign company.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.0. It should be clear by now, from what has preceded, that the concept of in-company training and, consequently of the training of in-company trainers in Greece is still underdeveloped both, quantitatively and qualitatively. The research team, however, has been able, through this study, to sense a trend toward some dynamic development. We base this sense on two factors. First, we have found the concept of in-company training to be in the midst of a dynamic transition. Some companies in our "sample" asked us kindly to come back to them at the end of 1988 because they are currently planning or initiating in-company training activities and they wish to be listed with the companies which are offering systematic training to their employees and to young apprentices. Second, the views on the future prospects of a number of selected key people, who are directly or indirectly involved with this concept, are generally positive.

4.1 Views of the VIPs

4.1.1 A number of important people representing institutions and organizations which have some direct or indirect relationship with the concept of in-company training were interviewed, in order to gain insight into the dynamic aspect of this type of training. In summing up their views one can recognize, on the outset, a general agreement on the importance of in-company training for the development of the national economy. At the same time, however, they all agree that this type of training must be conceptualized and institutionalized and the responsibility for this could be assigned to the "social partners" on an equal participation basis, and not to the government alone.

They also all agreed, that within the framework of the institutionalization there must be a body of in-company trainers formed and consisting of employees (not out-of-company professionals) and, consequently, a body of trainers for these in-company trainers. They also agreed that the initiative for the conceptualization and institualization of in-company training must be taken by the private enterprises and their representative bodies.

4.1.2 They all seemed to agree that there must be additional incentives provided by the government (subsidies, tax incentives, etc) to promote and enhance in-company training activities, especially for young people in vocational schools and in apprenticeship programs*. They also felt that these incentives must be extended to include any effort which will be undertaken collectively or on an individual company basis for the establishment of a centre or department which will organize and implement training activities for in-company trainers.

4.1.3 Most VIPs agreed that in-company trainers must organize themselves professionally and unionize, using the rationale that in this way the in-company trainer will gain some professional status, and he will cease to be playing the split-role of a professional in some technical field who at the same time assumes the responsibilities of a trainer. A few VIPs, however, strongly disagreed with the "establishment of another union within the company" which "already has too many unions".

---

* Currently there is a training levy (an average of approximatively 2% of the payroll) withheld from all companies and returned upon verification by the company of training activities.

4.1.4 The VIPs all seemed to agree (with one exception) that when the in-company training is institutionalized, an agreement must be established on a minimum set of qualifications which an in-company trainer must have before he is assigned training responsibilities by the management. They also noted that this qualification requirement must include an element of continuing training on the state-of-the-art developments of both, the specific technical field and the training and learning methodology.

4.2 Views of the Training Manager

4.2.0 The next group of people whose views could help us assess the dynamic aspect of in-company training are the Training Managers. To be more precise we should refer to them as generally personnel managers because the majority of them had the title of Personnel Director or Personnel Assistant Director. Some functioned as Educational Advisers while others worked in the Technical Department of the Company.

4.2.1 It is interesting to start with their views on the qualifications of an effective Training Manager. We are not able to give statistical significance to their answers (the question was not put to all who were interviewed and it was included in the questionnaire). However, those who were asked seem to agree on the following profile :

> An experienced company employee with a university degree, who has had 2-3 years experience as an in-company trainer and who has displayed skills for identifying training needs and

for designing training programs. Some answers went into greater detail mentioning such additional criteria as general acceptance by management and the rest of the employees, good personal communication skills, comprehensive industrial experience regarding production and manufacturing, knowledge of learning methodologies for adults, etc...

4.2.2. They seem to recognize, without exception, the importance of both, initial and continuing training for the in-company trainers. However, they also agreed that the opportunities for offering such staff development programs are few and the resources (both, material and human) are limited. They felt that this problem could be solved, to a certain extent, with the formation by a number of interested companies, of an inter-enterprise institute which would provide all the necessary resources for the initial and continuing training of in-company trainers.

4.2.3 Finally, there was general agreement that the concept of in-company training of the employees is spreading gradually among the companies whose size and budgets can justify such an activity, and that the in-company training of young people will also improve qualitatively and quantitatively, once there is the proper support by the Government and there are improvements with regard to the incentives offered to the companies, through further subsidies by OAED and by the European Social Fund.

4.3 Views of the Trainers

4.3.0 Some very interesting aspects came out from interviewing this group, which was intentionally placed at the epicenter of the study. There was a special effort to include a large sample of trainers for the research. We interviewed, so far, of 53 in-company trainers (52 men and 1 woman), more than half of whom were university graduates, a little less than a third had graduated from secondary or tertiary education technical-vocational institutes and the remaining had finished only the compulsory education cycle. Almost two thirds of them had no special training, whatsoever, in preparation for their training function. The average age was 42.

4.3.1 It is proper to start with their view on the need for the in-company trainers to acquire proper preparation before assuming responsibilities as trainers and continuous training during their tenure. They were unanimous. They consider this a necessary condition not only in order for them to function effectively but also in order to improve their self-esteem as trainers in the company. They seem to place great importance on their positive acceptance by the rest of the employees in the company (fellow employees actually), and they felt that this can be best accomplished if the image of the in-company trainer is improved; one way for this to happen is for all trainees to know that their trainers are well prepared as trainers and are not selected for this function simply because they are more experienced or because they are section leaders or department heads.

4.3.2 They seem to place great importance on the establishment of special incentives (economic, promotional, in-company status, etc..) by the company as a means to both, project the company's

true and serious intentions for continuously improving the knowledge and skills of their employees and also to recruit and retain the best employees as trainers. It must be noted, however, that although these incentives are not present today in most companies, some of the trainers interviewed seemed to have relatively high job satisfaction as in-company trainers.

4.3.3 Finally, it is important to note that all in-company trainers who were interviewed for this study seemed to be fully aware of their limitations as trainers. This observation is not only based on specific comments made by the trainers but also on their extensive and analytical description of the ideal in-company trainer. What follows is a synthesis of the abilities and skills which were most often mentioned by the respondents as some of the most important qualities possessed by the ideal in-company trainer :

- practical experience in the field which contains the subject matter of the training,
- experience as a trainer/teacher and teaching and technical skills,
- being up to date on the state-of-the-art of his profession,
- experience in industry,
- ability to transmit knowledge,
- having psycho-paedagogic knowledge,
- being knowledgeable in work psychology,
- ability to use modern audio-visual media,
- ability to develop training programs,

- possession of specialized knowledge,
- continuous updating and upgrading of knowledge and training skills,
- impressive and pleasant appearance,
- excellent communication

For the ideal in-company trainer of young people additional qualities were mentioned :

- to be interested in new ideas and innovations,
- to be easily accessible,
- to be well up-to-date on the techniques for transmitting knowledge.

4.4 Views of the Trainees

4.4.0 The views of the trainees, which follow, are primarily the views of adult employees in the companies that were visited by the interviewers. Nevertheless, also included are views of young apprentices who were found almost exclusively in large publically -owned or -controlled organizations. Apprenticeship in large private companies was found to be on the decline in spite of the fact that recently there has been a major cooperative effort by ΣΕΒ (Union of Greek Industries) and the Ministry of Education to place a large number of TEI students in Industry for practical training. We are also including in this section the views of the director of the apprenticeship programs of OAED, which we feel reflect partly on some functional problems of in-company training of young people.

4.4.1 It seems that the only problem which is identified by the in-company trainees, regarding their in-company training, is the limited number of training hours. To the key question "how do you feel your training could become more effective ?" almost all answered "by increasing the number of training hours". There was no mention made to improving the effectiveness of the trainer. On the contrary, to such specific question the overwhelming majority answered that they agree with the teaching approach and the training methodology, in general.

4.4.2 At the insistence of the interviewers to draw out their comments on the effectiveness of the training offered, they gave some general views on what, in their opinion, makes an effective trainer. The criteria which were generally proposed did not differ much from those suggested by the trainers or the training managers. Those which did stand out, however, and are worth examining further, perhaps through a follow-up study, were two. One was the language used by the trainer. "He must know how to use the language properly". The other concerned the social approach factor. "He must be close to the trainees and have a good character".

4.4.3 The views of young apprentices which follow, were drawn from a small number of young people met by the interviewers in two large public organizations (OLP, Greek Shipyards). Their biggest concern was that there is no compatibility between their interests and the training offered by the firms. As a result, the practical training which they receive in the company is often irrelevant to the theory they learn at school. The ones who seemed satisfied with their in-company training, with no exception, were those who were successful in matching their training tasks to their school work. They all expressed the view that their trainers should have had some special preparation for training young people and they should not only rely on their technical expertise. They were divided, however, on whether their school teacher should participate in their in-company

training. Finally, they seemed to place greatest importance to the "good manners" of their in-company trainer and also "his patience in answering all our questions".

4.4.4 Next we present some views drawn from an interview with the director of apprenticeship of OAED. What stands out is that the apprentices receive proper in-company training only in large companies with systematic training systems. In the small companies the apprentices are in most cases lucky if there is someone supervising their work. Obviously, here one cannot examine the problem of trainer preparation and further training, but rather what extra measures, including more effective incentives, could be established to make apprenticeship training more attractive to small enterprises. Of course one finds the same problems in some large companies, as well. In this case the problem is not functional but rather it reflects the management's attitude toward training, in general, and toward apprenticeship, which (in their view), creates problems in the production. It takes greater pressure on the part of OAED to convince these companies to accept apprentices. As a result, it is not realistic to suggest that they assign properly prepared or trained trainers to the young trainees whom they accept. The first priority for OAED school directors is the placement of the trainee, and it seems this is done in many situations at the cost of having the trainee work in a company with minimum supervision and consequently receiving marginal training.

4.5 Views of Trade Union Representatives

4.5.0 The trade union representatives who were interviewed were members and officers of national union organizations. They all seemed to reflect on the problem of training the trainers through its broader context, namely, through the more general problem of in-company training.

4.5.1 They seem to view vocational training positively. They recognise the importance of in-company training when it relates directly to the subject of work. This they see as a measure to help the worker secure his job, receive regular promotion and increase his productivity. They also see an improvement in in-company relations between management and personnel, as a result of in-company training, which they seem to feel benefits the union movement. For any training or education which does not relate directly to work, they feel it must take place outside the company in an official educational institution with the employee receiving leave of absence from his employer for this purpose. Furthermore, they seemed to agree that in-company training should be subject to negotiations -whereever it is provided- between the Worker's Council and the company's management, rather than between the national or regional union bodies and the national or regional employer organizations. In any other situation it can be negotiated between the employer and the company's union.

4.5.2 Regarding the in-company trainers, they all seem to agree on the importance of their receiving proper pre-service training and continuous in-service training. However, they do not see how the unions could play an active role in this, namely by offering special programs of there own on, e.g., industrial relations or on relations with the trainee, etc. They would, however, agree to participate in the selection of trainers, provided that a universally accepted framework of typical and essential qualifications would be established for the in-company trainer. Their view of the ideal in-company trainer does not differ from the views of the other concerned groups which were already presented in this report. Only they seemed to give additional emphasis on the social skills, especially on the trainer's "self-awareness regarding his broader social role, beyond the boundaries and aims of the company".

4.5.3. Finally, they were unanimously opposed to the idea of the trainers organizing themselves into a union. They felt that, since the in-company trainers are also employees of the company this meant that they already belonged to a worker's union which can protect their rights. On the other hand, they would not object to seeing the in-company trainers form a special union if they are hired by the company in order to function exclusively as trainers or if they are freelance trainers who visit the company occasionally to offer their services on demand.

4.6 The Forum Proceedings

4.6.0 The Forum which was planned as part of the methodology, took place on the 15th of June 1988 at the EEC office in Athens, which was kind enough to provide free of charge the use of its conference facilities and also beverages and a working lunch. The research team had selected approximatively 40 to 50 persons who participated as respondents in the project and who were involved for many years in in-company training as practitioners, supervisors or managers. Only 20 showed up (names and affiliations are presented in the Appendices). Nevertheless, the meeting was successful and it definately justified the usefulness of workshops as research tools. The meeting was divided into two parts. During the first part the participants through a "tour de table" were given the opportunity to express their views on the contents of the intermediate report. The second part was devoted to the discussion of recommendations for future action by the Greek authorities.

4.6.1 It was gratifying to the research team to discover during the first part of the meeting that their reporting of the situation regarding in-company training in Greece was fairly accurate. This was substantiated by the comments made during the discussion. Nevertheless, two significant points were raised which concerned issues that were either absent in the report or not emphasized enough. One of the points, which was brought out in the

discussion by all the union representatives present at the meeting was that the report did not emphasize enough the problem which arises from the fact that in most of the cases, neither the trainer nor the trainee have a say on their being selected to function as trainers or to undertake training. The other point, which the report missed out completely (this was raised by the trainers present at the meeting), was that, at least for the Greek in-company trainer, his training must include one or two foreign languages (preferably English). The reason for this was that most trainers are expected to generate training manuals for the operation of new equipment (bought from abroad without exception), using as primary sources the manuals which accompany the newly purchased equipment and which are written in a foreign language.

4.6.2 Some additional comments made, which have been included, however, in the intermediate report, were the following :

- The training of trainers must be continuous.

- The training program for trainers must have two parts. One on planning training activities and one on implementing them.

- How can one plan training activities more effectively in order to minimize some negative effects of training on the trainee (it was mentionned that many trainees did not wish to return to their ordinary job after they undertook training, but rather they had higher aspirations. Some of them even looked for a new job elsewhere).

- The necessity for "human contact" between trainer and trainee was emphasized again as an important aspect for the development of training programs for trainers.

- Planners of training programs for in-company trainers must examine closely the problem which arises when the in-company relationship between the trainer and the trainee is that of supervisor to worker.

4.6.3 In the second part of the meeting where the discussion turned into making recommendations and proposals for future action, the following were some of the most interesting points :

- There was general agreement that emphasis must be placed on developing qualities rather than typical qualifications for the in-company trainers. Exception to this was the observation of a training manager in a Life Insurance company who insisted that at least for the free-lance trainers there must be established some minimum qualifications.

- It was agreed that the training of trainers should have two components : training inside the company and training outside the company. Also it should be of short duration and should be repeated frequently; it should be continuous.

- There must be generated a catalog which would provide information on resource people whose expertise on a subject could make them potential trainers for in-company trainers. There are many people (university professors, teachers, etc.) who are not aware that their services are needed in this capacity.

- With regard to the European dimension, the recommendations were two : 1) to link the industry with tertiary education institutions (perhaps under the auspices of COMETT) in order to develop training packages for both, in-company trainees and in-company trainers, and 2) to seek ways to face collectively the problem of unreasonably high costs of training both trainers and trainees on the operation of advanced technology equipment (as an example, reference was made that SIEMENS was asking 700,000 DM for a training program on a new radar).

V. CONCLUSIONS

5. Summary

5.1 In-company training in Greece can be characterized as underdeveloped but definately in transition. It seems that the message concerning the value of training as a good investment, with short and long term significant returns for the company, has been well received by managers. In addition the financial incentive offered by the Social Fund and OAED is making the training option more and more attractive to managers. More significant, however, is the new "offensive" policy on training, introduced recently by the Ministry of Employment, which, in the words of the Minister of Employment, intends to "lead" rather than "lag" youth unemployment.

5.2 Systematic in-company training for young people is offered mainly by large, publicly controlled or owned companies. These companies have training departments supervised by training managers. The few private companies which have a similarly advanced training environment, are either multinational companies which use training resources based mainly on their headquarters site somewhere in Europe, or, if they are Greek their training investment reflects an advanced attitude toward training which prevails at the highest level of management.

5.3 The training manager is, in most situations (with the exception of some large public and private companies), the personnel manager who, however, has not been hired to manage the in-company training and therefore, his selection was not based on either accumulated experience in training or training knowledge and skills. He was simply asked to add another task, that of training, to his general duties within the context of personnel management. Obviously this situation could affect negatively the company's philosophy regarding the training of its trainers.

5.4 The situation of the trainers seems consistent with the generally prevailing attitudes just described above. The incompany trainer is in most cases an experienced employee who as a trainer fulfils only two of the criteria established by the CEDEFOP study on the training of trainers. Namely, he has mastered the subject which he is asked to transmit to the trainees and he has also accumulated many years of practical experience. Most importantly, he generally does not see himself as a trainer nor does he aspire to advance in the company as a trainer. In some cases, it seems that he fears that his tenure in the training department will inhibit or delay his career advancement. The common incompany trainer has limited further training which will enhance his training capabilities, aside from a two-week-long general seminar provided by OAED and recommended for all trainers who participate in training schemes partly funded by the Social Fund and OAED.

5.5 Finally, regarding the recruitment and development of trainers, the main problem lies in the fact that there is a scarcity of resource people. The pool of qualified people to play the role of the trainer manager, the trainer of the trainers or even the specially trained trainer, simply is not there. The university management programs do not offer options on personnel development. On the other hand, SELETE (the only institution which trains vocational education teachers), turns out teachers who have a good paedagogical background but their technical training is not oriented toward production but toward school teaching.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0. The approach being followed in this last section has two parts : The first defines the general problem as it emerged from the data collected, and the second sets out some guidelines for the formulation of alternative policy proposals.

6.1 The Definition of the Problem

6.1.1 From what has preceded, it seems to be possible to define the problem of training the in-company trainers in the given setting which characterizes the case of Greece. The setting can be analyzed using five components. The historical context, the social context, the company context, the trainer context and the trainee context.

6.1.2 In-company training in a systematic manner is a relatively recent development in Greece. Excluding the companies which constitute branches of multinational organizations, systematic in-company training inside public or private organizations has developed gradually during the last two decades. The rate of expansion for this type of training scheme has increased considerably during the last decade, especially since the entrance of the country into the European Common Market and thereby, the commencement of the partial funding of such activities by the Social Fund. This change was found to be in a more dynamic state during the time of this research.

6.1.3 The social context is generally characterized by a developing economy ($ 4,200 per capita GDP for 1987) and by a relatively unbalanced labour market, in which the vocational aspirations of young people are not compatible with the demand for specialized manpower by level of education and by field of speciality. A very large number of young people

who have pursued general education studies, followed by university education, reach the age of 25 without having acquired any employable skills.

6.1.4 The company context varies considerably. One finds, on the one hand, small and large companies with modern organizational schemes in which in-company training constitutes an integral part, and on the other, small and large companies with marginal organization, usually run on a day to day basis, by one man, in which in-company training is considered a waste of time. In addition, all private companies which have established in-company training systems consider this concept an in-company affair and seem opposed to any "outside" solutions. Finally, the concept of the Training Manager as a separate management entity is not generally applied and it seems that in-company training will largely remain the responsibility of the personnel director.

6.1.5 The in-company trainer is largely an experienced employee of the company (usually with supervisional responsibilities), well educated and trained for his technical field, but not necessarily well prepared as a trainer, especially of young people. Depending on the level of development of in-company training in his organization, he may or he may not be well motivated for his training function. Nevertheless, the level of his motivation as a trainer is not in parity with his level of motivation regarding his professional growth in his technical profession. As far as his qualifications as a trainer are concerned he has limitations in paedagogics (especially for young people) and in affective skills.

6.1.6 The in-company trainee, if he is a company employee he is largely in the age group 31-40 years old. He is in need primarily of continuing or further training. If newly hired he may need induction training. If he is in the age group 16-25 years old, he is in the company as an apprentice from a secondary vocational school or as a Technological Education student who is undergoing a six month practical training programm. He may also be a university student (in his senior year) who is working (with or without pay) in the company in a special project related to his diploma thesis.

6.1.7 In summing up, one could define the problem relating to the in-company training as follows : Given the context of an underdeveloped in-company training situation as analyzed above, there is a need for the design, development and field evaluation of a mechanism which will provide effective training (pre-service and in-service) for the in-company trainers of young people in apprenticeship and of adult employees.

6.2 Guidelines for Solutions

6.2.1 Having defined the general problem regarding the training of in-company trainers of young people one may, in turn, attempt to set out some guidelines for the formulation of alternative solutions. The first important observation is that the specific problem cannot be isolated from its broader context which is an underdeveloped in-company training system in transition. It is rather obvious from the results that any solution attempt must begin with a major effort to conceptualize in-company training within the general economic development plan of the country and within the national policy to reduce unemployment.

6.2.2 Any solution to the problem of training the in-company trainers must take into account the wide variation of training settings found by the research : on the one end companies with sophisticated training systems and on the other, companies which under great pressure accept apprentices but limit their contribution to their training to a marginal supervision. Therefore, any answer to this problem should offer alternative approaches so that each company can select the scheme which fits its setting and is within its economic means.

6.2.3 It became obvious from all interested parties interviewed for this research that the training of in-company trainers, like the in-company training, is an in-company problem which requires an in-company solution, in the sense that no solution will be effective if it is conceived, formulated and implemented by persons outside the general environment of an enterprise.

6.2.4 Especially since the general problem of in-company training affects young people as well, who do not belong in any sense to the specific working environment, but rather are still students in school in the midst of their physical, emotional and mental development, attention must be given so that no one-sided solution prevails, which focuses only on the needs of the adult employee trainee and ignores or underrates the needs of the young apprentice. This can be guaranteed by institutionalizing the concept of in-company training and, in turn, of the training of in-company trainers. Such an action will secure the cooperation and support of the "social partners" for the success of the solution which will be eventually adopted.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Paleocrassas, S.N., "The Necessity for Provision of In-company Training by the Greek Industry", ECONOMIC POST, Athens, December 23, 1982. (in Greek).

2. "Professional Status and Training of Trainers in the European Community", CEDEFOP, Berlin, 1983.

3. Karmas, C. and Paleocrassas, S.N., "Costs and Financing of Vocational Education and Training in Greece", CEDEFOP, Berlin - Athens, April 1985.

4. Stavrou, S., "Vocational Training in Greece", CEDEFOP, Berlin, 1985.

5. "Training of Trainers", Proceedings of a two days Symposium on the Training of Trainers in Greece, 25-26 November, 1985, OEOB, Athens, Greece (in Greek).

6. "Youth Employment in Greece : Innovative Practices in Greek Enterprises", CEGOS HELLAS, Athens, 23 September, 1986 (in Greek).

VIII. APPENDICES

ENTERPRISES AND ORGANIZATIONS

1.	AEGAION	P
2.	AGRICULTURAL BANK	S
3.	ALLATINI	P
4.	ALUMINIUM OF GREECE	P
5.	APPRENTICESHIP SCHOOL OF ELEFSIS (OAED)	S
6.	CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES OF NORTHERN GREECE	P
7.	EEDE (GREEK MANAGEMENT SOCIETY)	S
8.	EKO (GREEK OIL COMPANY)	P
9.	ELKEPA (GREEK PRODUCTIVITY CENTRE)	S
10.	ELLENIT	P
11.	ETMA	P
12.	FAMAR (MARINOPOULOS DRUGS AND MEDECINES)	P
13.	FULGOR (CABLE INDUSTRY)	P
14.	GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	S
15.	GENERALI INSURANCE COMPANY	S
16.	GREEK SHIPWYARD S.A.	P
17.	GOOD YEAR	P
18.	HELLENIC AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY	P
19.	HELLENIC ARMS AND WEAPON INDUSTRY	P
20.	HELLENIC DISTILLERY OF ASPROPIRGOS S.A.	P
21.	HELLENIC STEEL	P
22.	HEINNINGER BEER	P
23.	HOECHST GREECE	P
24.	INTERAMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY	S
25.	KERANIS TOBACCO COMPANY	P

26.	MOBIL	P
27.	MOTOR OIL	P
28.	NATIONAL BANK	S
29.	NATIONAL GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY	S
30.	NATIONAL NAVAL BASE	P
31.	OLYMPIC AIRWAYS.	S
32.	ORGANIZATION PORT AUTHORITY (PIREUS)	S
33.	PIRKAL (MUNITION AND EXPLOSIVES INDUSTRIES S.A.)	P
34.	PUBLIC ELECTRICITY ENTREPRISE	S
35.	SATO (OFFICE FURNITURE)	P
36.	SELETE (INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING VOCATINAL EDUCATION TEACHERS)	S
37.	SIEMENS	P
38.	SHIPYARD OF ELEUSIS	P
39.	STATE AIRCRAFT WORKS	P
40.	TEOKAR (AUTOMOBILE WORKS S.A.)	P
41.	TITAN CEMENT COMPANY S.A.	P
42.	THESSALY STEEL WORKS S,A.	P
43.	SPINNING MILLS VELKA S.A.	P
44.	ZANAE (FOOD FURNITURE)	P

LEGEND : P = PRODUCTION

S = SERVICE

V I P S

1. MR PAPALEXOPOULOS

   PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERATION OF GREEK INDUSTRIES.

2. MR BOUMIS

   PERSONNEL DIRECTOR OF TITAN CEMENT COMPANY / MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF CEDEFOP.

3. MR KIRIAZIS

   PRESIDENT OF THE CHAMBER OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE IN ATHENS.

4. MR SOFOULIS

   PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AEGAION.

5. MR FAKIOLAS

   PROFESSOR OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AT ETHNIKON METSOVION POLYTECHNIO.

6. MR PATERAKIS

   PRESIDENT OF SELETE.

7. MRS PATOUHA

   DIRECTOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF OAED.

8. MR MARKOPOULOS

   FORMER DIRECTOR OF IVEPE.

9. MR HALAS

   ELKEPAS' MANAGER FOR TRAINING SYSTEMS / INITIATOR AND RESEARCHER FOR SPECIAL TRAINING CORSES FOR INDUSTRIAL TRAINERS.

NAME LIST OF FORUM PARTICIPANTS

ATHENS OFFICE EEC	NAME	ORIGIN	TEL.
1	S. PALEOCRASSAS.	RESEARCH TEAM	6567363
2	C. ECONOMOU	RESEARCH TEAM	3645391
3	J. TSIKINAS	SICGN S.A.	031/760403
4	D. CONSTANTINIDOU	CENECO HELLAS Ltd	6476746
5	J. KAVADIAS	IVEPE*	2466392
6	G. ROUSSOS	ALUM. OF GREECE	0267/42492
7	G. TRIANTAFILOPOULOS	IVEPE*	2466392 2466160
8	G. HALAS	ELKEPA*	8069901
9	J. KAZAZIS	MIN.of EDUCATION	3235722
10	S. KAHRIS	Cement Federation	5233868
11	Th.VOUTSELAS	EOMMEX*	7710024
12	G. KOTOULAS	ALUM of Greece	0267/42492
13	G. MAHAIRAS	EAB*	0262/52214
14	B. DIMITROPOULOS	Polytechnical School	6528654
15	R.FAKIOLAS	Polytechnical School	7784689
16	D. ARAPAKOS	TITAN S.A.	061/931802
17	A. KALETSANOS	OLP*	4630256
18	D. ECONOMOU	President IVEPE SEB*	3237325
19	G. PROTOPAPAS	TITAN S.A. RESEARCH TEAM	3230101
20	M. PSILOPOULOU	RESEARCH TEAM	6472773

21	J. PAPAMICHAIL	GENERALI LIFE Insurance Company	7704512
22	G. ZIOMAS	Ministry of Work	5233146

IVEPE : Companies Association for the Industrial and Professional Training of their staff

ELKEPA: Greek Productivity Center

EOMMEX: Greek Public Organization of small and medium sized Enterprises.

EAB : Hellenic Aircraft Industry

OLP : Organization Port Authority

SEB : Federation of Greek Industries

TREATMENT OF ELEMENTS CONCERNING THE QUESTIONARIES

OF - ENTERPRISES,
- TRAINERS, and
- TRAINING MANAGERS

1. Organization's Activity

Production 70,4 %

Services 29,6 %

2. Number of employed persons

80 123 persons
72% men and
28% women

3. STRUCTURE OF THE IN-COMPANY TRAINING DEPARTMENT

3.1 Aims/ Goals (% of the whole)

- Informing after recruitment in the job training	19,0 %
- Motivation /increasing productivity	21,0 %
- Updating of skills	23,8 %
- Improving working climate	16,2 %
- Preparing for promotion /or changing job	17,1 %
- Other	2,9 %
T O T A L	100,0

3.2 TRAINERS

They are almost divided into free-lance and in-company trainers, and the most of them are part time training (68,6%), the other 31,4% are full-time training.

3.2.1 Trainers'selection criteria:

The 85% place emphasis on substantial qualifications and the 15% on formal qualifications.

3.2.2 Trainers'origin

The 76,2% of the enterprises use trainers from the private sector,
the 19% from the public sector and
the 4,8% from the other origin (Universities, schools,...)

3.2.3 In-company trainers

The 59,4% of the in-company trainers are rotating between training and other assignments,
the 31,3% of the in-company trainers have a full training engagement,
the 3,1% are engaged by appointment and
the 6,2% follow another combination /scheme.

3.2.4 Training Programme

In the 81,5%of the cases there is a programme of updating the knowledge of the trainers,
No such programme existed in 13,5% of the cases.
In every second case, trainers attended a single training program. The rest attended two and more. In almost every case thow, the training programs were ajusted at the job (main activity: not training related).

3.3 Training environment

	Area, where training takes place (%of the whole)	
in the company	In the factory /working rooms	20,3 %
	In other buildings /ateliers	20,3 %
	In special Public schools	8,3 %
	In special Private schools	22,6 %
	In schools abroad	20,2 %
	In special schools founded from the Branch or Unions	8,3 %
	T O T A L	100,0

4. TRAINEES

Training fields (% of the whole)

General training	3,9 %
Work safety	3,9 %
Master kraftsmen	10,7 %
Management	3,9 %
Production	20,4 %
Administration	10,7 %
Financial Department	8,7 %
Commercial sector (salesmen)	7,3 %
Informatics	13,5 %
Maintenance Engineers	8,7 %
Electrical maintenance personnel	7,8 %
T O T A L	100,0

The majority (approx. 60%) of the trainees in the enterprises were aged between 26 - 40 years. Next largest age group :41 years and older.
Young trainees (age group 16-25 years) were only found in enterprises with apprenticeship activity.
The majority of the private enterprises train their young people (aged 21 years and older) on the job.

5. FINANCING OF TRAINING

All the Enterprises are financing the training activity by their own resources, the 50% are assisted by the EEC, and only the 5% are financing training activities by public resources.

Estimated % of total training cost on Labour cost budget : it varied - as an average- between 2 - 11% (any subvention included)

6. TRAINING MANAGERS

The 61,5 % belong to the Personnel Department,
the 7,7% belong to the Economic Department,
the 15,4 % belong to the Technical Department,
and the 15,4 % are education councellers (advisers).

7. TRAINERS

Men : 97,9 %
Women :2,1 %
Age :average 42
Education :

Higher education	55,3 %
Technical education	27,7 %
Basic-general education	17,0 %

The 40,4 % have assisted at a Training of Trainers program, but the 59,6% have no paedagogical formation.

The majority have selected the training job.

The backing up through Unions is in the 66,7% of the cases positive.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TRAINING MANAGERS

1. Background information.

Name of company : Geographical area:

Size of company : (total no employees:)
(total no trainers:)
(total no trainees:)

Training manager : job title

Trainers : job titles Trainers : job types

Other details : (sex / age)

young training / apprenticeship / employed.

2. Recruitment of trainers :

What criteria are used ? (for example : min. number years experience/ specific qualifications/skills/other)

What is the exact content of this job ?

What is the challenge of this job ?

Who signed responsible for its promotion ?

What is the company's according policy ?

- internal / external use.

- "spot" choises.

What is the organigram of training ?
(semestral, annual ?)

Compare training in relation to the other activities of the entreprise :

Why is your entreprise training people ?
Please name a few good reasons for it.

Historic view of the training activities.
(How did it began ? From whom ? Who organised it at first ?)

Future trends.

Quantitative data.

Short description of training activities.

Do you accept young people for training ?
(% of the 16-25 aged to total of employement)

Is this number increasing or decreasing ?

3. What is the background/qualifications/skills of the trainers currently ?

- educational

- working experience.

4. Role and duties of trainers :

Are there different types of trainers ?
(technical/consulting, etc...)

5. What is to your opinion the ideal trainer ?
(Which do you think are the most important qualifications of a trainer ?)

- practical experience in the specific area the trainer will mainly act as such.
- training/technical/teaching/academic qualifications.
- experience as a trainer/teacher/instructor.
- uptodate in professional information and the situation of training in the company industy.
- experience in industry.
- social approach to the trainees.
- awareness of modern instructing techniques.
- other,...

6. What kind training is available for them ?

Who does their possible career in the company look like ? Is there any kind of hierarchy between trainers ?

- induction / motives
- specialized
- continuing / updating.

Is training voluntary ? To what extent self initiated ? Accredited ? (selection criteria)

Where does it take place (open learning/home,in-company,out wards in college/external/other) ?

Who are the trainers ? (profil)

Are there procedures allowing releases for training purposes ? /
Is there any kind of support for training beyond workink time ?

Is there any kind of support in the company for an out-of-company training ? (participation, motivation, other induction)

In your opinion, can the present stand of training of the trainers be judged as satisfactory ? Useful ?

Do you think a different style (content) of training would be more suitable ? Would you prefare it if you had a free choice ? What would it then look like ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATIONAL/TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS

Name :

Organization : Public or Private

Aims :

Activities area :

Programs :

Number of trainees :

Objectives :

Financial Resources :

Is it an exclusively educational organization ?

Any other activities ?

The trainers to be trained: are they exclusively trainers of young people, or are they supposed to train adults as well ?

Who organises and prepares the according programs ?

Criteria ? Do you provide official certificates, if not degrees ?

Do you provide certificates of adequacy ?

- what kind ?

- what level / equivalence ?

Are the acquired (training + certificates) sufficient qualifications for trainers job in industry or the public sector ?

Is the training provided complementary to the main specialization of the trainer ? Or is he to be trained in his main specialization to ?

Duration of training programs :

Main training subjects :
(pedagogical lines...)

The trainers to be trained: Is training going to be their only activity or are they going to practive training next to other activities ?

Are your training programs aiming at the (above) first or second group of future trainers?

Statistical data (annual) for backing above information :

Number of trainers (each group separately, if possible) :

Number of graduates :

Origin of trainers :

Level of their background education :

What is your opinion on the training of trainers, in general ?
(possibly a new profession?)

Are there programs for continuing/updating trainers'skills and knowledge (every two-three years...) ?

In your opinion, what is the profile of a trainer of trainers, and the profile of the ideal trainer ?

What people do you employ as trainers of trainers ?

How many such trainers do you employ ?

Who are they ?

Have they ever had any special education before ?

How are they trained ?

Their level ?

Level of their degrees ?

Are their certificates or degrees recognised ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TRADE UNION REPRESENTATIVES.

1. Present position of the representative in the Unions' hierarchy.

2. Name of said Union, main activities :

3. Have you ever been involved in negotiations on industrial training ?

4. Do you think that industrial training is more or less negotiable at trade Union level, or should it rather be overtaken by the works councils' representatives ?

5. Do you think it would be better for workers to be trained in appropriate / special industrial schools ?

6. Do you think the trainers should unionize ?

   If yes, should they built a professional union or join the works (factory) industrial branch trade Union ?

   Do you think this could help institutionalize the trainers' job ?

11. Any agreements with the employer on training ?

12. Do you think that the improvement of industrial training rather encourages, rather opposes, or is it indifferent to the union movement ?

13. Have you ever being involved at the setting-up of training programs?

    If not yet, do you think you actually should ?

14. What role do you think training can play in the future industrial relations ?

15. Do you think that your (possible or desirable) involvement in recruiting of trainers would be useful ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR VIP'S

1. Is the professional training of young people

   1.1. a necessary complement of their academic or technical education?

   1.2. obligatory part of the training program ?

   1.3. Do you think that an educational organisation must participate, concerning
   - the subject
   - the follow up
   - the financial participation, etc.
   -
   -
   -
   -

   1.4. Do you think the constitution of a special branch of training of trainers in the company is necessary ?
   -
   -
   -

2. In your opinion, should the entreprises think about ways of developping a sort of corps of trainers, in order to assure professional training on:

   - the programs
   - the practical work
   - the cooperation whith the State
   - the constitution of the national educational programs
   - the control and the supervision of the training of young people.

   What could these ways be ?

3. Do you think that trainers should be provided with certificates of adequacy, with or without state intervention?

   yes

   no

   If yes, at what level ?

4. Which do you think should be the educational directives ?

   - field
   - duration
   - level
   - orientation

5. Whith whose cooperation should these training activities be realised?

   - managers
   - external agents
   - training offices of entreprises
   - other,
   -
   -
   -
   -
   -

6. Can you mention a number of ways through which could you support an effort to establish a few norms for improving -in general- the trainers' qualifications ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TRAINEES.

Background information :

Name of trainee : Age : Sex :
(facultative)

Number of months / years for a complet training :

In your opinion, why does the company realise training ?

Can you think of any ways through which your training could be made more effective ?

Are you satisfied with the teaching methods ?

Do you agree with the present training methodology as a whole ?

Are you involved in preparing the new teaching stuff ?

Have you ever been asked to ? If not, have you ever tried to ? Did anybody try to stop you ? Have you ever felt frustrated about it ?

What does "transmissibility" of a trainer mean to you ?

-

-

-

-

-

How does your training program look like ?

How much of your training takes place in the company ?

Who traines you in the company:

- one person
- more than one person

In case of trouble, whom would you ask to see first?

Name the person who you think is responsible for your training performance and who could advise you in case you would come up to him with a problem ?

ANONYMOUS - CONFIDENTIAL

PART B' TRAINERS' POINTS OF VIEW

SECTOR : PUBLIC PRIVATE
ACTIVITY : INDUSTRY SERVICES
OCCUPATION: FULL PART
POSITION : STABLE BY APPOINTMENT

A. TRAINERS OF MAIN AND EXLUSIVE OCCUPATION.

A.1. PERSONAL DATA.

1.1. AGE : ---------- (SEX : ----------)
1.2. EDUCATION : ----------
---------- ----------
---------- ----------

1.3. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND CAREER : ----------

Special degrees

Standard degrees
(+ with special training)

Other

Levels : Vocational High School Technical College

A.2. Personal dedication motives / degree of satisfaction / expectations

---

A.3. Duration of training programs (daily, weekly, ...)

A.4. How come you have chosen the trainers' job / Profession ?

Motivation : ----------

A.5. Are you involved in identifying the training needs in your activities' sector ? ----------

---

A.6. The trainer in the company : supported or rejected by Unions / Other aspects : ----------

---

B B.1. Professions' public image / personal view / estimations-evaluation

---

B.2. Describe the profile of the ideal trainer :

B.3. What do you think about further training / updating skills ?

C. IF TRAINING IS NOT THE MAIN AND EXLUSIVE OCCUPATION

C.1. PERSONAL DATA

1.1 AGE : ---------- SEX : ----------
1.2 EDUCATION : ----------
1.3 SECTOR OF MAIN OCCUPATION : ----------

1.4 EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND CAREER : ----------

Special degrees

Standard degrees
(with special training)

Other

Levels :	Vocational	High School	Technical College
	---	---	---

C.2. Personal dedication motives / degree of satisfaction / expectations

C.3. Duration of training programs (daily, weekly ...)

C.4. How come you have chosen the trainers' position / profession ?

Motivation : ----------

C.5. Are you involved in identifying the training needs in your sector activities ? ----------

C.6. The trainer in the company : Supported or rejected by Unions ? / Other aspects : ----------

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TRAINERS

1. Background information.

Name of company: Geographical area :

Job title: Sex: Age :

Number of years in company (in total) :

" " " " " (as a trainer) :

Educational backround / career / qualifications-skills

2. Training.

have you had any training after taking over the training role ?
If any :

- inductive
- special (technical/counselling etc.)
- continuing/updating

Do you work with other trainers together ?
- in a similar role ?
- in a different role ?

What is the style of training:
- open
- accredited
- self-initiated
- compulsory
- in/out of work time
- external/internal
- financed by the company ?

Has it ever been evaluated ? If yes: Has it been found useful ?
If yes : why ?

How would it be improved ? What alternative or complementary training could be useful ?

Do you anticipate any futuretraining on opportunities for career development ?

3. What -according to your opinion- your main duties and responsibilities ?

Are there any duties and responsibilities for which you feel you should have received special training, but you actually haven't ?

4. How would you describe the ideal trainer ?

5. Do you think one needs any particular characteristics/skills to work as a trainer of young people ?

6. If you could, alternatively, attend f. ex. three different training causes, which one would you choose ? Why ?

7. If someone was appointed for a job similar to yours, what would you tell him be needed to learn for producing better results ?

8. The trainers social aspect.
Acceptance by the group (trainees).
Social approach.

CEDEFOP — European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

The training/development of in-company trainers/supervisors of young people — The case of Greece

IVEPE
Xenophon Constantinides, John Markopoulos, Stamatis Paleocrassas, George Protopapas, Kathrin Economou, Maria Psilopoulou
June 1988

CEDEFOP Document

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

1989 — IV, 72 pp. — 21.0 × 29.7 cm

EN, FR

ISBN 92-826-0647-3

Catalogue number: HX-56-89-328-EN-C

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 5

Venta y suscripciones · Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές
Sales and subscriptions · Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti
Verkoop en abonnementen · Venda e assinaturas

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad

Librairie européenne / European Bookshop

Jean De Lannoy

CREDOC

J. H. Schultz Information A/S
EF Publikationer

Bundesanzeiger Verlag

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

Mellor's Bookstore

Boletín Oficial del Estado

Mundi Prensa Libros, S.A.

Journal officiel
Service des publications des Communautés européennes

Government Publications Sales Office

Government Stationery Office
HMSO Books (PC 16)

Alan Armstrong Ltd

Marhoitz'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung

Librairie scientifique Lucien de Boeck - AEDE

Messageries Paul Kraus

Impresa Nacional

Distribuidora Livros Bertrand Lda
Grupo Bertrand, SARL

Diarios sues ved ofter A/S

European Community Information Service

Renouf Publishing Co. Ltd

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

Journal Department

Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes

European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training,
Jean Monnet House,
Bundesallee 22, **D-1000 Berlin 15**
Tel. (030) 88 41 20; Telex 184 163 eucen d; Telefax (030) 88 41 22 22

CEDEFOP

Catalogue number: HX-56-89-328-EN-C

23 05 17

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 5

ISBN 92-826-0647-3

OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
L-2985 Luxembourg

9 789282 606476